

Dena C. Sharp (State Bar No. 245869)
 Jordan Elias (State Bar No. 228731)
 Scott M. Grzenczyk (State Bar No. 279309)
GIRARD SHARP LLP
 601 California Street, Suite 1400
 San Francisco, CA 94108
 Tel: (415) 981-4800
 Fax: (415) 981-4846
 dsharp@girardsharp.com
 jeliass@girardsharp.com
 scottg@girardsharp.com
Attorneys for Advertiser Plaintiffs

Justina K. Sessions (State Bar No. 270914)
WILSON SONSINI GOODRICH & ROSATI
 Professional Corporation
 One Market Plaza
 Spear Tower, Suite 3300
 San Francisco, California 94105
 Telephone: (415) 947-2197
 Facsimile: (415) 947-2099
 Email: jsessions@wsgr.com
*Counsel for Defendants Google LLC,
 Alphabet Inc., and YouTube, LLC*

Eric L. Cramer*
 Caitlin G. Coslett*
BERGER MONTAGUE PC
 1818 Market St., Suite 3600
 Philadelphia, PA 19103
 Tel.: (215) 875-3000
 Fax: (215) 875-4604
 ecramer@bm.net
 ccoslett@bm.net
Attorneys for Publisher Plaintiffs

[Additional Counsel Listed on Signature Page]

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
 SAN JOSE DIVISION

In re GOOGLE DIGITAL ADVERTISING
 ANTITRUST LITIGATION

Case No. 5:20-cv-03556-BLF

In re GOOGLE DIGITAL PUBLISHER
 ANTITRUST LITIGATION

Case No. 5:20-cv-08984-BLF

**JOINT PROPOSED AGENDA FOR
 JUNE 10, 2021 CASE MANAGEMENT
 CONFERENCE**

Date: June 10, 2021
 Time: 11:00 a.m.
 Courtroom: 3 – 5th Floor
 Judge: Hon. Beth Labson Freeman

In accordance with the Court’s Orders dated February 9, 2021 (ECF No. 89), and March 2, 2021 (ECF No. 109), Plaintiffs Hanson Law Firm, PC, Surefreight Global LLC d/b/a Prana Pets, and Vitor Lindo (collectively, “Advertiser Plaintiffs”), Plaintiffs Genius Media Group, Inc., Sterling International Consulting Group, The Nation Company, L.P., The Progressive, Inc., Sweepstakes Today, LLC, JLaSalle Enterprises LLC, and Mikula Web Solutions, Inc. (collectively, “Publisher Plaintiffs”), and Defendants Google LLC, Alphabet Inc., and YouTube, LLC (collectively, “Defendants” or “Google”), hereby provide a proposed agenda of issues for the Case Management Conference set for June 10, 2021, at 11:00 a.m. and any positions of which they would like to advise the Court.

1. Update on Judicial Panel on Multidistrict Panel Proceedings

The parties will be prepared to update the Court on the pending MDL proceedings.

2. Case Schedule

The parties wish to discuss scheduling, and the Publisher Plaintiffs and Advertiser Plaintiffs would like to discuss scheduling Rule 16 and Rule 26 conferences.

In addition, Google anticipates filing on June 4, 2021 a Motion to Dismiss the Consolidated Publisher Complaint filed on April 5, 2021. *See* ECF No. 96. The Publisher Plaintiffs and Google jointly propose that the Court enter the following briefing schedule for the motion:

Event	Proposed Deadline
Publisher Plaintiffs’ Opposition to Google’s Motion to Dismiss	July 23, 2021
Google’s Reply in Support of its Motion to Dismiss Consolidated Publisher Plaintiffs’ Complaint	August 27, 2021
Hearing on Google’s Motion to Dismiss Consolidated Publisher Complaint	October 14, 2021 (reserved) or such other time as set by the Court

3. Discovery

Publisher Plaintiffs and Advertiser Plaintiffs wish to discuss obtaining early discovery from Google. Under the Court’s Order Granting Motion to Stay Discovery issued on December 8, 2020, discovery in the Advertising Case was stayed “until Google either answers the amended complaint or

1 the motion to dismiss hearing date, whichever is earliest.” Case No. 5:20-cv-03556-BLF, ECF No. 53.
 2 Accordingly, as the Court heard Google’s motion to dismiss the Advertiser Case on April 8, 2021, the
 3 parties understand discovery is no longer stayed.

4 On April 30, 2021, both sets of Plaintiffs jointly served Defendants with a First Set of Requests
 5 for Production of Documents that included five requests for the production of documents that Google
 6 already produced: in connection with *State of Texas, et al. v. Google LLC*, No. 4:20-cv-957-SDJ (E.D.
 7 Tex.) and *United States, et al. v. Google LLC*, No. 1:20-cv-03010-APM (D.D.C.), and investigations
 8 related thereto; to the House Committee on the Judiciary, Subcommittee on Antitrust, Commercial and
 9 Administrative Law; to the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, Subcommittee on Antitrust,
 10 Competition Policy, and Consumer Rights; to the United Kingdom’s Competition and Markets
 11 Authority (“CMA”) in connection with the CMA’s Online Platforms and Digital Advertising Market
 12 Study; and to the Australian Competition & Consumer Commission, Digital Platforms Branch in
 13 connection with its Digital Platforms Inquiry, Ad Tech Inquiry, and Digital Advertising Services
 14 Inquiry. Google has not provided written responses or objections to Plaintiffs’ First Set of Requests for
 15 Production of Documents, taking the position that those requests are not deemed served until the
 16 parties’ Rule 26(f) conference, *see* Fed. R. Civ. P. 34(b)(2) and 26(d)(2).

17 Google also takes the position that the requests are overly broad because they seek all
 18 documents that Google produced in several investigations that encompass many issues beyond those
 19 raised in the plaintiffs’ complaints. Producing any subset of documents that might be relevant to these
 20 cases would require a full re-review, using custodians and search terms. Rather than negotiating review
 21 parameters piecemeal, the better and more efficient approach is for the plaintiffs to serve
 22 comprehensive document requests and for the parties to negotiate a comprehensive set of search
 23 parameters.

24 Plaintiffs’ position is that there is no burden to Google from producing these pre-packaged
 25 productions, and Google’s suggestion that there may be extraneous material does not outweigh the
 26 benefit that such re-production would have as Plaintiffs’ develop their claims in this litigation. Nor is
 27 there any need given their prior production in other matters for Google to re-review these documents
 28 when Google can turn them over (subject to the protective order that will be entered in this case) and

1 Plaintiffs can decide for themselves what evidence bears on their claims. Google's proposal to
2 negotiate search terms is far less efficient where it does not deny that these productions to antitrust
3 regulators contain relevant evidence.

4 In addition, on May 28, 2021, both sets of Plaintiffs jointly served their Second Set of Requests
5 for Production of Documents to Defendants, which included a request for the production of documents
6 that Google already produced to the French Competition Authority (L'Autorité de la Concurrence) in
7 connection with the authority's inquiries into Google's ad tech services, as has recently been reported.

8 On April 29, 2021, Publisher Plaintiffs sent Google a letter regarding Google's obligation to
9 preserve documentary and electronic evidence relevant to the claims in the Publisher Plaintiffs' case.
10 Google acknowledges that it must take reasonable measures to preserve relevant documentary and
11 electronic evidence.

12 In addition, building on negotiations that began in the Advertiser Case in 2020, the parties
13 continue to negotiate the terms of a proposed Stipulated Protective Order, a proposed Stipulated Order
14 Regarding Discovery of Electronically Stored Information, and a proposed Stipulated Order
15 Concerning Expert Discovery. The parties anticipate being able to submit such stipulations soon, or to
16 provide the court with a short primer of the parties' respective positions on any areas of disagreement.
17

18 * * *

19 The parties look forward to discussing these issues and any other issues the Court raises at the
20 June 10 conference.
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: June 3, 2021

By: /s/ Caitlin G. Coslett
Eric L. Cramer*
ecramer@bm.net
Michael C. Dell'Angelo*
mdellangelo@bm.net
Caitlin G. Coslett*
ccoslett@bm.net
Patrick F. Madden*
pmadden@bm.net
BERGER MONTAGUE PC
1818 Market St., Suite 3600
Philadelphia, PA 19103
Tel.: (215) 875-3000 / Fax: (215) 875-4604

Sophia M. Rios (305801)
srios@bm.net
BERGER MONTAGUE PC
12544 High Bluff Drive, Suite 340
San Diego, CA 92130
Tel.: (619) 489-0300 / Fax: (215) 875-4604

Daniel J. Walker*
dwalker@bm.net
BERGER MONTAGUE PC
2001 Pennsylvania Ave., NW, Suite 300
Washington DC 20006
Tel.: (202) 559-9745

BOIES SCHILLER FLEXNER LLP
Philip C. Korologos*
pkorologos@bsflp.com
Brianna S. Hills*
bhills@bsflp.com
BOIES SCHILLER FLEXNER LLP
55 Hudson Yards, 20th Floor
New York, NY 10001
Tel.: (212) 446-2300 / Fax: (212) 446-2350

David Boies*
dboies@bsflp.com
BOIES SCHILLER FLEXNER LLP
333 Main Street
Armonk, NY 10504
Tel.: (914) 749-8200 / Fax: (914) 749-8300

Abby L. Dennis*
adennis@bsfllp.com
Jesse Panuccio*
jpanuccio@bsfllp.com
BOIES SCHILLER FLEXNER LLP
1401 New York Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20005
Tel.: (202) 895-7580 / Fax: (202) 237-6131

Mark C. Mao (236165)
mmao@bsfllp.com
Sean P. Rodriguez (262437)
srodriguez@bsfllp.com
BOIES SCHILLER FLEXNER LLP
44 Montgomery Street, 41st Floor
San Francisco, CA 94104
Tel.: (415) 293-6820 / Fax: (415) 293-6899

Sabria A. McElroy*
smcelroy@bsfllp.com
BOIES SCHILLER FLEXNER LLP
401 E. Las Olas Blvd., Suite 1200
Fort Lauderdale, FL 33301
Tel.: (954) 377 4216 / Fax: (954) 356-0022

Stephen M. Tillery*
stillery@koreintillery.com
Michael E. Klenov (277028)
mklenov@koreintillery.com
Carol L. O'Keefe*
cokeefe@koreintillery.com
Jamie Boyer*
jboyer@koreintillery.com
KOREIN TILLERY LLC
505 North 7th Street, Suite 3600
St. Louis, MO 63101
Tel.: (314) 241-4844 / Fax: (314) 241-3525

George A. Zelcs*
gzlcs@koreintillery.com
Robert E. Litan*
rlitan@koreintillery.com
Randall P. Ewing*
rewing@koreintillery.com
Jonathon D. Byrer*
jbyrer@koreintillery.com
Ryan A. Cortazar*
rcortazar@koreintillery.com
KOREIN TILLERY LLC
205 North Michigan Avenue, Suite 1950
Chicago, IL 60601
Tel.: (312) 641-9750 / Fax: (312) 641-9751

*Interim Co-Lead Counsel for the Publisher
Plaintiffs*

Dated: June 3, 2021

By: /s/ Dena C. Sharp
Dena C. Sharp (State Bar No. 245869)
Jordan Elias (State Bar No. 228731)
Scott M. Grzenczyk (State Bar No. 279309)
GIRARD SHARP LLP
601 California Street, Suite 1400
San Francisco, CA 94108
Tel: (415) 981-4800
Fax: (415) 981-4846
dsharp@girardsharp.com
jelas@girardsharp.com
scottg@girardsharp.com

Tina Wolfson (State Bar No. 174806)
Rachel Johnson (State Bar No. 331351)
Theodore W. Maya (State Bar No. 223242)
AHDoot & WOLFSON, PC
2600 West Olive Ave., Suite 500
Burbank, California 91505
Tel.: (310) 474-9111
Fax: (310) 474-8585
twolfson@ahdootwolfson.com
rjohnson@ahdootwolfson.com
tmaya@ahdootwolfson.com

*Interim Co-Lead Counsel for the Advertiser
Plaintiffs*

Archana Tamoshunas (*pro hac vice*)
TAUS, CEBULASH & LANDAU, LLP
80 Maiden Lane, Suite 1204
New York, NY 10038
Tel: (212) 931-0704
Fax: (212) 931-0703
atamoshunas@tcllaw.com

April Lambert (*pro hac vice*)
RADICE LAW FIRM, PC
475 Wall Street
Princeton, NJ 08540
Tel: (646) 245-8502
Fax: (609) 385-0745
alambert@radicelawfirm.com

Executive Committee for the Advertiser Plaintiffs

Dated: June 3, 2021

By: /s/ Justina K. Sessions
Justina K. Sessions (State Bar No. 270914)
WILSON SONSINI GOODRICH & ROSATI
Professional Corporation
One Market Plaza
Spear Tower, Suite 3300
San Francisco, California 94105
Telephone: (415) 947-2197
Facsimile: (415) 947-2099
Email: jsessions@wsgr.com

Jonathan M. Jacobson
WILSON SONSINI GOODRICH & ROSATI
1301 Avenue of the Americas, 40th Floor
New York, NY 10019
Telephone: (212) 497-7758
Facsimile: (212) 999-5899
Email: jjacobson@wsgr.com

*Counsel for Defendants Google LLC,
Alphabet Inc., and YouTube, LLC*

ATTESTATION

I, Caitlin G. Coslett, am the ECF User whose ID and password are being used to file the foregoing document. In compliance with Civil Local Rule 5-1(i)(3), I attest that concurrence in this filing has been obtained from all signatories above.

By: /s/ Caitlin G. Coslett